UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,372	07/02/2001	Mark E. Van Dyke	KER020/4-005CON	3035

21586 7590 11/30/2005

VINSON & ELKINS, L.L.P.
1001 FANNIN STREET
2300 FIRST CITY TOWER
HOUSTON, TX 77002-6760

EXAMINER	
GHALI, ISIS A D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/899,372	VAN DYKE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isis Ghali	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09/09/05*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *55-65 and 67-96* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *69-92 and 94-96* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *55-65,67,68 and 93* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The receipt is acknowledged of applicants' amendment filed 09/09/2005.

1. This application contains claims 69-92, 94-96 drawn to a nonelected invention in the paper filed 02/28/2002. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claims 55-65, 67, 68 and 93 are included in the prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 55-65, 67, 68 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification as originally filed in the parent application 09/330,550 lacks support to the limitation: "about 90% of said water soluble peptides are between about 300 and about 1300 daltons in molecular weight". Original claims 1-54 in the present application and in the parent

application do recite this limitation. The specification only disclosed 850 daltons molecular weight, page 9, line 7.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 09/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse this rejection by arguing that the concentration of 90% and the range of 300-1300 daltons were in the originally filed claims.

The examiner agrees with applicants that these limitations were present in the original claim 66 filed with the preliminary amendment and original claims are part of the specification, however claim 66 is now canceled. Therefore, the examiner position is the specification, and the application as whole as currently standing does not contain any support to the presently claimed concentration and range.

4. Claims 55-65, 67, 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for topical composition, does not reasonably provide enablement for any other composition. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Among these factors are: the nature of the invention; the breadth of the claims; the state of the prior art; the relative skill of those in the art; the amount of direction or guidance presented; the predictability or

unpredictability of the art; the presence or absence of working examples; and the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

The nature of the invention: The nature of the invention is topical composition comprising soluble peptides of a specific molecular weight. Nowhere in the specification applicants disclosed composition other than topical.

The breadth of the claims: The claims are broad. The claims encompass wide varieties of compositions including oral and parentral.

The state of the prior art: The state of the art recognized peptides administered topically to treat wounds.

The relative skill of those in the art: The relative skill of those in the art is high.

The amount of direction or guidance presented: The specification provides no guidance, in the way written description, on composition comprising water soluble peptides that is administered by any route other than topical administration for wound treatment or as an implant. It is not obvious from the disclosure of topical composition comprising peptides if any other composition comprising peptide will work in terms of wound treatment. *In re Dreshfield,* 110 F.2d 235, 45 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1940), gives this general rule: "It is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it must appear in an applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient number of the members of a group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals or chemical combinations included

in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired result." The article "Broader than the Disclosure in Chemical Cases," 31 J.P.O.S. 5, by Samuel S. Levin covers this subject in detail. A disclosure should contain representative examples which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. *See In re Riat et al.* (CCPA 1964) 327 F2d 685, 140 USPQ 471; In re Barr et al. (CCPA 1971) 444 F 2d 349, 151 USPQ 724.

The predictability or unpredictability of the art: The lack of guidance from the specification and from the prior art with regard to composition comprising soluble peptides used for treating wound or implantation that is administered by any other route than topically makes practicing the claimed invention unpredictable in the terms of other forms of the composition.

The presence or absence of working examples: The specification discloses topical composition for treating wounds. No working examples to show other compositions such as oral or parentral. Therefore, the specification has enabled only topical composition.

The quantity of experimentation necessary: The practitioner would turn to trial and error experimentation to practice the instant composition for treating wound or for implantation using non-topical composition without guidance from the specification or the prior art. Therefore, undue experimentation becomes the burden of the practitioner.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 09/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the issue is not whether specification enables all

the compositions to which the peptide composition can be added, but rather, the enablement of the peptide composition is independent of adding it to a particular type of carrier. The specification has adequate description of how to obtain the peptide composition and how to use it to stimulate growth of useful cell types.

In response to these arguments, the examiner position is that the specification has enabled how to make the peptide composition and how to use it topically to stimulate growth of useful cell types, and has not enabled any uses other than topically for stimulating wound healing and cell growth. Nowhere in the specification have applicants disclosed composition useful for oral or parentral administration to stimulate cell growth and wound healing. Therefore, the specification has only enabled how to make and how to use topical composition comprising peptides.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 55-65, 67, 68 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,495,173 ('173).

US '173 teaches composition comprising keratin and method for its production. The process included the steps of oxidizing animal or human hair, feathers, claws, horns, hoofs, scales and the like. Oxidizing agents included peroxides or peracetic acid. The oxidation is followed by neutralization then gel filtration. The filtrate is dried, i.e. form powder. Solvent used to solubilize keratin is ethanol or methanol. The product produced by the method of the reference could have molecular weight of 200-5000. See col.2, lines 13-15, 21-24, 31-42; col.4, lines 52-55; col.5, lines 1-3, 45-50, 53-54; col.10,

lines 15-17. Keratin is made of peptides. The process of production does not impart patentability to product claims.

However, US '173 does not teach the amount of peptides having the low molecular weight of 200-5000.

The amount of the peptides does not impart patentability to composition claims since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller,* 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 09/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The main gist of applicants' argument against the obviousness rejection of claims 55-65, 67, 68, and 93 over US '173 is that the reference does not teach peptides having molecular weight between 300-1300 daltons. The reference process used enzymatic hydrolysis and not oxidation.

In response to these arguments, the examiner position is that the claims are directed to composition, and the elements of the composition are disclosed by US '173, and the future intended use does not impart patentability to the claims, as well as the method of its production. The examiner is pointing out to col.5, line 49, wherein the reference clearly teaches the preferred molecular weight of the produced peptide is 200-5000, which overlaps the claimed range. The disclosed examples and preferred embodiment do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971).

Regarding the enzymatic hydrolysis step, the language of the claims does not exclude the presence of this step.

8. Claims 55-65, 67, 68 and 93 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,276,138 ('138) in view of US 6,506,732 ('732).

US '138 teaches a solubilized keratin powder from animal hair or wool (abstract; col.65-67). The method of production included the steps of oxidation by hydrogen peroxide or peracetic acid; precipitation of a powder; and using solvent such as acetone, methanol or ethanol (col.3, lines 3-5, 21-24; col.4, lines 3, 20-28). Keratin is made of peptides. The process of production does not impart patentability to product claims.

However, US '138 does not teach the low molecular weight of the peptide or its amount in the composition.

The claimed molecular weights do not impart patentability to the claims, absent evidence to the contrary.

The amount of the peptides does not impart patentability to composition claims since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller,* 105 USPQ 233.

US '732 teaches topical composition that exhibits wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, said composition comprising soluble peptides having molecular weight between 200-1400 (abstract; col.2, lines 31-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide composition comprising soluble peptides as disclosed by US '138, and select peptides having low molecular weight in the range of 400-1400 daltons as disclosed by US '732, motivated by the teaching of US '732 that the low molecular weight peptides are suitable for topical composition that exhibits wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, with reasonable expectation of having topical composition comprising low molecular weight peptides that is useful for wound healing and cell growth promotion with minimum allergic activities.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 09/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that US '138 does not teach the claimed molecular weights of the peptides and same step of precipitation under the same conditions. US '723 teaches peptides from milk proteins and not combinable with US '138 as no suggestion in any of the references for the combination.

In response to these arguments, the examiner position is the claims are directed to composition, and the elements of the composition are disclosed by US '138, and the future intended use does not impart patentability to the claims, as well as the method of its production. The disclosed examples and preferred embodiment do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the

features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the precipitation under specific conditions) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In response to applicant's argument that US '732 is not combinable with US '138 because it teaches peptide from milk protein, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, US '732 teaches composition comprising peptides used to treat wounds as desired by applicants. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, US '732 is relied upon for the solely teaching of the suitability of peptides of low MW for wound treatment, and one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the peptide having low MW disclosed by US '732 in the composition disclosed by US '138 because US '732 teaches that the low molecular weight peptides are suitable for topical composition that exhibits

wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, with reasonable expectation of having topical composition comprising low molecular weight peptides that is useful for wound healing and cell growth promotion with minimum allergic activities. A conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) does not require absolute predictability, only a reasonable expectation of success; and references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

10. Claims 55-65, 67, 68 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,763,583 ('583) in view of US '732.

US '583 teaches a water soluble protein derived from human or animal hair (abstract; col.2, lines 15-18, 57-62; col.4, lines 49-50). The soluble protein is useful in cosmetics and medicines (col.6, lines 20-24). The soluble protein is produced by the process that comprised the steps of oxidation using hydrogen peroxide, neutralization of the produced aqueous solution followed by filtration (col.3, lines 20-25; col.4, lines 1-3, 14-23). Organic solvents are used such as methanol and ethanol (col.5, lines 66-67; col.6, lines 15-17). The process of production does not impart patentability to product claims.

However, US '583 does not teach the low molecular weight of the peptide or its amount in the composition.

The claimed molecular weights do not impart patentability to the claims, absent evidence to the contrary.

The amount of the peptides does not impart patentability to composition claims since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller,* 105 USPQ 233.

US '732 teaches topical composition that exhibits wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, said composition comprising soluble peptides having molecular weight between 200-1400 (abstract; col.2, lines 31-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide composition comprising soluble peptides as disclosed by US '583, and select peptides having low molecular weight in the range of 400-1400 daltons as disclosed by US '732, motivated by the teaching of US '732 that the low molecular weight peptides are suitable for topical composition that exhibits wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, with reasonable expectation of having topical composition comprising low molecular weight peptides that is useful for wound healing and cell growth promotion with minimum allergic activities.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 09/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse this rejection by arguing that US '583 does not teach the same steps for production of the peptides and does not suggest the same molecular weight for the peptides. No motivation to combine US '5 83 and US '732.

In response to these arguments, the examiner position is the claims are directed to composition, and the elements of the composition are disclosed by US '583, and the future intended use does not impart patentability to the claims, as well as the method of its production. The disclosed examples and preferred embodiment do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). In response to applicant's argument that US '732 can not be combined with US '583, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, US '732 teaches composition comprising peptides used to treat wounds as desired by applicants. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, US '732 is relied upon for the solely teaching of the suitability of peptides of low MW for wound treatment, and one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the peptide having low MW disclosed by US '732 in the composition disclosed by US '583 because US '732 teaches that the low molecular weight peptides are suitable for topical composition that exhibits wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, with reasonable expectation of having topical composition comprising low molecular weight peptides that is useful for wound healing and cell growth promotion with minimum allergic activities. A conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) does not require absolute predictability, only a reasonable expectation of success; and references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

12. Claims 55-56, 67, 68 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,932,552 ('552) in view of US '732.

US '552 teaches keratin composition for wound dressing and scaffolding (abstract; col.2, lines 45-51; col.3, lines 19-25; col.5, lines 1-7). Keratin is derived from human or animal hair (col.2, lines 52-54). The keratin is formed by a process comprising

the steps of oxidation using peracetic acid, filtration, drying, forming a powder (col.2, lines 57-64; col.3, lines 40-65). The process also included the step of neutralization by a base (col.2, lines 67-col.3, line 3). The process of production does not impart patentability to product claims.

However, US '552 does not teach the low molecular weight of the peptide or its amount in the composition.

The claimed molecular weights do not impart patentability to the claims, absent evidence to the contrary.

The amount of the peptides does not impart patentability to composition claims since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller,* 105 USPQ 233.

US '732 teaches topical composition that exhibits wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, said composition comprising soluble peptides having molecular weight between 200-1400 (abstract; col.2, lines 31-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide composition comprising soluble peptides as disclosed by US '552, and select peptides having low molecular weight in the range of 400-1400 daltons as disclosed by US '732, motivated by the teaching of US '732 that the low molecular weight peptides are suitable for topical composition that exhibits wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, with reasonable expectation of having topical composition comprising low molecular weight

peptides that is useful for wound healing and cell growth promotion with minimum allergic activities.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 09/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse this rejection by arguing that US '552 teaches peptides of higher MW and not produced by the same steps as claimed. US '552 is not combinable with US '732.

In response to these arguments, the examiner position is the claims are directed to composition, and the elements of the composition are disclosed by US '552, and the future intended use does not impart patentability to the claims, as well as the method of its production. The disclosed examples and preferred embodiment do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). In response to applicant's argument that US '732 is not combinable with US '552 because it teaches peptide from milk protein, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, US '732 teaches composition comprising peptides used to treat wounds as desired by applicants. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the

claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, US '732 is relied upon for the solely teaching of the suitability of peptides of low MW for wound treatment, and one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the peptide having low MW disclosed by US '732 in the composition disclosed by US '552 because US '732 teaches that the low molecular weight peptides are suitable for topical composition that exhibits wound healing and cell growth properties but does not have allergic activities, with reasonable expectation of having topical composition comprising low molecular weight peptides that is useful for wound healing and cell growth promotion with minimum allergic activities. A conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) does not require absolute predictability, only a reasonable expectation of success; and references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 5,877,227 disclosed composition for topical use comprising peptides having low molecular weight, as low as 200.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isis Ghali whose telephone number is (571) 272-0595. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Isis Ghali
Examiner
Art Unit 1615

IG

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600